UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,703	01/02/2004	Arjun Chandrasekar Iyer	SBL0011C1US	3820

60975 7590 08/19/2010

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER	
HARPER, ELIYAH STONE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/19/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,703	CHANDRASEKAR IYER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ELIYAH S. HARPER	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 May 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *116-162* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *116-162* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/5/2010 has been entered. Pursuant to said amendment claims 116, 120, 128, 132, 137, 141, 146, 150, 155 and 159 have been amended. No new claims have been added or canceled. Accordingly, claims 116-162 are pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 116-162 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Specifically the claim limitations discussed during the interview and argued in the subsequent request for continued examination are disclosed by the newly cited reference.

Claim Objections

Claim 154 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 154 depends from claim 154. The examiner believes and will assume for the purposes of examination that claim 154 was meant to depend on claim 153, appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 116-162 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6,438,542 (hereinafter Koo) in view of US 6523028 (hereinafter DiDomizio)..

As for claim 116 Koo discloses: The first table and the second table are stored in a computer-readable storage medium, and the generating uses a relationship between the first table and the second table to construct the set of SQL statements, and the set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables querying the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set (See column 5 lines 20-30);

wherein the querying the first table is performed using the processor querying the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first

result set, wherein the querying the first table is performing using the processor querying the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a second result set, wherein the querying the second table is performed using the processor, and the querying the first table and the querying the second table are performed without joining the first table and the second table (See column 5 lines 25-30 and column 7 lines 10-35) and ,joining using the processor the first result set and the second result set to produce a third result set (See column 6 lines 40-50);

Koo does not explicitly disclose: Receiving input data, in a computer system wherein the input data comprises a query, a first table, and a second table generating, using a processor of the computer system a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, and returning the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data DiDomizio however does explicitly disclose: Receiving input data, in a computer system wherein the input data comprises a query (See figure 8A), a first table, and a second table (See column 10 lines 1-15) generating, using a processor of the computer system a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, (See column 6 line 60- column 7 line 6) and returning the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data (See column 9 lines 30-45). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of DiDomizio into the system of Koo. The

modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references (i.e. motivation from the references themselves). In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since DiDomizio's teaching would enable user's of the Koo system to have the tables be from unfamiliar or structured data (See DiDomizio column 2 lines 40-50). Consequently, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success since the DiDomizio reference is designed to provide universal querying to information that is distributed throughout different systems (See title and abstract).

As for claim 117 the rejection of claim 116 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: a parent/child relationship between the first and second tables, wherein one of the first and second tables is a parent table, and if the first table is the parent table, the second table is a child table, and if the second table is the parent table, the first table is the child table (See column 4 lines 61-67).

As for claim 118 the rejection of claim 117 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: querying the parent table substitution using the set of SQL statements to produce the result set; and using the first result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the child table, wherein the second set of SQL

statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 5 lines 1-19).

As for claim 119 the rejection of claim 118 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: querying the child table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 120 the rejection of claim 119 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses the third result set depends on the querying the first table and the querying the second table (See column 10 lines 5-20 note the attributes must match.

As for claim 121 the rejection of claim 118 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: the second set of SQL statements comprises: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the first result set (See column 5 lines 10-20).

As for claim 122 the rejection of claim 116 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: using the first result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the second table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 5 lines 20-30)

As for claim 123 the rejection of claim 122 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: querying the second table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 124 the rejection of claim 123 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: returning the third result set as a result of the query of the first and second tables (See figure 12).

As for claim 125 the rejection of claim 122 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the result set (See column 6 lines 45-67).

As for claim 126 the rejection of claim 116 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: obtaining a search specification for the query of the first and second tables, wherein the set of SQL statements comprises a query statement to select a record from at least one of the first and second tables if the record satisfies the search specification (See column 7 lines 20-35).

As for claim 127 the rejection of claim 126 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: executing the set of SQL statements to produce the third result set; and returning the third result set in response to the search specification (See figure 12).

.

As for claim 128 Koo discloses: a processor, a memoy unit coupled to the processor (See column 3 lines 1-15) generating means uses a relationship between the first table and the second table to construct the set of SQL statements, and the set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables querying the first table determining means for determining if a part/child relationship exists between the first and second tables (See column 5 lines 61-67). First querying means for querying the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set (See column 5 lines 20-30);

Second querying means for querying the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set, wherein the querying the first table is performing using the processor querying the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a second result set, wherein the querying the second table is performed using the processor, and the querying the first table and the querying the second table are performed without joining the first table and the second table (See column 5 lines 25-30 and column 7 lines 10-35) and ,joining using the processor the first result set and the second result set to produce a third result set (See column 6 lines 40-50); the generating means the determining means, the first querying means, the second querying means and the joining means reside in the memory unit;

Koo does not explicitly disclose: Receiving means for receiving input data, wherein the input data comprises a query, a first table, and a second table generating means for generating, a set of SQL statements to query the first table

and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, and returning the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data DiDomizio however does explicitly disclose: Receiving means for receiving input data, wherein the input data comprises a query (See figure 8A), a first table, and a second table (See column 10 lines 1-15) generating means for generating a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, (See column 6 line 60- column 7 line 6) and returning the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data (See column 9 lines 30-45). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of DiDomizio into the system of Koo. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references (i.e. motivation from the references themselves). In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since DiDomizio's teaching would enable user's of the Koo system to have the tables be from unfamiliar or structured data (See DiDomizio column 2 lines 40-50). Consequently, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success since the DiDomizio reference is designed to provide universal querying

to information that is distributed throughout different systems (See title and abstract).

As for claim 129 the rejection of claim 128 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: parent table determining means for determining if one of the first and second tables is a table is the parent/child relationship exists, and configured to indicate if the first table is the parent table, the second table is a child table, and if the second table is the parent table, the first table is the child table wherein the parent table resides in the memory unit (See column 4 lines 61-67).

As for claim 130 the rejection of claim 129 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: querying means for querying the parent table using the set of SQL statements to produce the result set; and using means for using the first result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the child table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table and the querying means and the using means reside in the memory unit (See column 5 lines 1-19).

As for claim 131 the rejection of claim 130 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: querying means is configured to query the child table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 132 the rejection of claim 131 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses wherein the result depends on the querying the first table and the querying the second table (See column 10 lines 5-20 note the attributes must match).

As for claim 133 the rejection of claim 130 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the first result set (See column 5 lines 10-20).

As for claim 134 the rejection of claim 128 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: using means for using the first result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the second table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 5 lines 20-30)

As for claim 135 the rejection of claim 128 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: obtaining means for obtaining a search specification for the query of the first and second tables, wherein the set of SQL statements comprises a query statement to select a record from at least one of the first and second tables if the record satisfies the search specification, and said obtaining means resides in the memory unit. (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 136 the rejection of claim 135 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses: executing means for executing the set of SQL statements to produce the third result set; and returning means for returning the third result set in response to the search specification, wherein said the executing means and the retuning means reside in the memory unit (See column 9 lines 23-35)

As for claim 137 Koo discloses: the generating instructions are configured to use a relationship between the first table and the second table to construct the set of SQL statements, and the set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables querying the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set (See column 5 lines 20-30);

First querying instructions to query the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set, second querying instructions to query the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a second result set the querying instructions to the first table and the querying instructions to the second table are performed without joining the first table and the second table (See column 5 lines 25-30 and column 7 lines 10-35) and ,joining using the processor the first result set and the second result set to produce a third result set (See column 6 lines 40-50); a computer readable storage medium, wherein the computer program product is the computer readable storage media (See column 3 lines 1-15)

Koo does not explicitly disclose: Receiving instructions to receive input data, wherein the input data comprises a query, a first table, and a second table generating, instructions to generate a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, and returning instructions to return the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data DiDomizio however does explicitly disclose: Receiving instructions to receive input data, wherein the input data comprises a query (See figure 8A), a first table, and a second table (See column 10 lines 1-15) generating, instructions to generate a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, (See column 6 line 60- column 7 line 6) and returning instructions to return the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data (See column 9 lines 30-45). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of DiDomizio into the system of Koo. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references (i.e. motivation from the references themselves). In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since DiDomizio's teaching would enable user's of the Koo system to have the tables

be from unfamiliar or structured data (See DiDomizio column 2 lines 40-50). Consequently, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success since the DiDomizio reference is designed to provide universal querying to information that is distributed throughout different systems (See title and abstract).

As for claim 138 the rejection of claim 137 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: a parent/child relationship between the first and second tables, wherein one of the first and second tables is a parent table, and if the first table is the parent table, the second table is a child table, and if the second table is the parent table, the first table is the child table (See column 4 lines 61-67).

As for claim 139 the rejection of claim 138 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: querying instructions configured to query the parent table using the set of SQL statements to produce the result set; and using the first result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the child table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 5 lines 1-19).

As for claim 140 the rejection of claim 139 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: wherein the second querying instructions are configured to querying the child table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 141 the rejection of claim 140 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses the third result set depends on the querying the first table and the querying the second table (See column 10 lines 5-20 note the attributes must match.

As for claim 142 the rejection of claim 139 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: the second set of SQL statements comprises: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the first result set (See column 5 lines 10-20).

As for claim 143 the rejection of claim 137 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: using instructions configured to use the first result set to construct a second set of SQL statements to query the second table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 5 lines 20-30)

As for claim 144 the rejection of claim 137 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: obtaining instructions configured to obtain a search specification for the query of the first and second tables, wherein the set of SQL statements comprises a query statement to select a record from at least one of the first and second tables if the record satisfies the search specification (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 145 the rejection of claim 144 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses: executing instructions configured to execute the set of SQL statements to produce the third result set; and returning instructions configured to return the third result set in response to the search specification, (See column 9 lines 23-35).

As for claim 146 Koo discloses a processor to execute instructions and a memory to store the instructions (See column 3 lines 1-15): the generating instructions use a relationship between the first table and the second table to construct the set of SQL statements, and the set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables querying the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set (See column 5 lines 20-30);

First querying instructions to query the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set, second querying instructions to query the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a second result set the querying instructions to the first table and the querying instructions to the second table are performed without joining the first table and the second table (See column 5 lines 25-30 and column 7 lines 10-35) and ,joining using the processor the first result set and the second result set to produce a third result set (See column 6 lines 40-50); a computer readable storage medium, wherein the

computer program product is the computer readable storage media (See column 3 lines 1-15)

Koo does not explicitly disclose: Receiving instructions configured to receive input data in a computer system, wherein the input data comprises a query, a first table, and a second table generating, instructions to generate a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, and returning instructions to return the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data DiDomizio however does explicitly disclose: Receiving instructions configured to receive input data in a computer system, wherein the input data comprises a query (See figure 8A), a first table, and a second table (See column 10 lines 1-15) generating, instructions to generate a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, (See column 6 line 60- column 7 line 6) and returning instructions to return the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data (See column 9 lines 30-45). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of DiDomizio into the system of Koo. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references (i.e. motivation from the references themselves). In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited

references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since DiDomizio's teaching would enable user's of the Koo system to have the tables be from unfamiliar or structured data (See DiDomizio column 2 lines 40-50). Consequently, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success since the DiDomizio reference is designed to provide universal querying to information that is distributed throughout different systems (See title and abstract).

As for claim 147 the rejection of claim 146 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: a parent/child relationship between the first and second tables, wherein one of the first and second tables is a parent table, and if the first table is the parent table, the second table is a child table, and if the second table is the parent table, the first table is the child table (See column 4 lines 61-67).

As for claim 148 the rejection of claim 147 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: querying instructions configured to query the parent table using the set of SQL statements to produce the result set; and using the first result set in constructing a second set of SQL statements to query the child table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 5 lines 1-19).

As for claim 149 the rejection of claim 148 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: wherein the second querying instructions are configured to querying

the child table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 150 the rejection of claim 149 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses the third result set depends on the querying the first table and the querying the second table (See column 10 lines 5-20 note the attributes must match.

As for claim 151 the rejection of claim 148 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: the second set of SQL statements comprises: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the first result set (See column 5 lines 10-20).

As for claim 152 the rejection of claim 153 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: using instructions configured to use the first result set to construct a second set of SQL statements to query the second table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table (See column 5 lines 20-30)

As for claim 153 the rejection of claim 146 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: obtaining instructions configured to obtain a search specification for the query of the first and second tables, wherein the set of SQL statements comprises a query statement to select a record from at least one of the first and

second tables if the record satisfies the search specification (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 154 the rejection of claim 153 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses: executing instructions configured to execute the set of SQL statements to produce the third result set; and returning instructions configured to return the third result set in response to the search specification, (See column 9 lines 23-35).

As for claim 155 Koo discloses: a processor; a memory unit coupled to the processor (See column 3 lines 1-15) the generating module uses a relationship between the first table and a second and the set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a statement that joins the first and second tables querying the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set (See column 5 lines 20-30);

A first querying module configured to query the first table using the set of SQL statements to produce a first result set, a second querying configured to query the second table using the set of SQL statements to produce a second result set the querying instructions to the first table and the querying instructions to the second table are performed without joining the first table and the second table (See column 5 lines 25-30 and column 7 lines 10-35) and ,a joining module configured to join the first result set and the second result set to produce a third

result set (See column 6 lines 40-50); the second querying module and the joining means reside in the memory unit (See column 3 lines 1-15)

Koo does not explicitly disclose: Receiving module configured to receive input data, wherein the input data comprises a query, a first table, and a second table generating, instructions to generate a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, and a return output data module configured to return the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data DiDomizio however does explicitly disclose: Receiving module configured to receive input data, wherein the input data comprises a query (See figure 8A), a first table, and a second table (See column 10 lines 1-15) generating, module to generate a set of SQL statements to query the first table and the second table wherein the set of SQL statements are based, at least in part upon the query, (See column 6 line 60- column 7 line 6) a return output data module configured to return the third result set, in response to the receiving the input data (See column 9 lines 30-45). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of DiDomizio into the system of Koo. The modification would have been obvious because the two references are concerned with the solution to problem of data processing, therefore there is an implicit motivation to combine these references (i.e. motivation from the references themselves). In other words, the ordinary skilled artisan, during his/her quest for a solution to the cited problem, would look to the cited references at the time the invention was made. Consequently, the ordinary

skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the cited references since DiDomizio's teaching would enable user's of the Koo system to have the tables be from unfamiliar or structured data (See DiDomizio column 2 lines 40-50). Consequently, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success since the DiDomizio reference is designed to provide universal querying to information that is distributed throughout different systems (See title and abstract).

As for claim 156 the rejection of claim 155 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: a parent/child relationship between the first and second tables, wherein one of the first and second tables is a parent table, and if the first table is the parent table, the second table is a child table, and if the second table is the parent table, the first table is the child table and the parent table resides in the memory unit (See column 4 lines 61-67).

As for claim 157 the rejection of claim 156 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: a querying module configured to query the parent table using the set of SQL statements to produce the first set and a using module configured to use the first result set to construct a second set of SQL statements to query the second table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table and the querying module and the using module reside in the memory unit (See column 5 lines 20-30)

As for claim 158 the rejection of claim 157 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: wherein the second querying module configured to querying the child table using the second set of SQL statements to produce the second result set (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 159 the rejection of claim 158 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses the third result set depends on the querying the first table and the querying the second table (See column 10 lines 5-20 note the attributes must match.

As for claim 160 the rejection of claim 157 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: the second set of SQL statements comprises: a query statement for selecting a record having a value of a foreign key field of the second table equal to a value of a target key field in the first result set (See column 5 lines 10-20).

As for claim 161 the rejection of claim 155 is incorporated and further Koo disclosesa using module configured to use the first result set to construct a second set of SQL statements to query the second table, wherein the second set of SQL statements comprises SQL statements other than a second statement that joins the second table to another table and the querying module and the using module reside in the memory unit (See column 5 lines 20-30)

As for claim 162 the rejection of claim 155 is incorporated and further Koo discloses: obtaining module configured to obtain a search specification for the query of the first and second tables, wherein the set of SQL statements comprises a query statement to select a record from at least one of the first and second tables if the record satisfies the search specification (See column 5 lines 20-30).

As for claim 163 the rejection of claim 162 is incorporated and further DiDomizio discloses: executing module configured to execute the set of SQL statements to produce the third result set; and returning instructions configured to return the third result set in response to the search specification, (See column 9 lines 23-35).

Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIYAH S. HARPER whose telephone number is (571)272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ELIYAH S HARPER/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166
August 15, 2010